

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF HOMŒOPATHY.

The Agitation of Thought is the Beginning of Truth.

VOL. 3.

NEW-YORK, APRIL, 1854.

NO. 12.

S. R. KIRBY, M.D., EDITOR.

ORGANON OF SPECIFIC HOMŒOPATHY;
or, an Inductive Exposition of the Principles of the Homœopathic Healing Art, addressed to Physicians and Intelligent Laymen. By C. J. HEMPEL, M.D. Rademacher & Sheek, Philadelphia. 8vo, pp. 216.

We have read this work with attention. It is, we believe, a first attempt of Dr. H. at authorship; he being known to the profession chiefly as a translator. During our reading of this work, it puzzled us a good deal to know what the author was driving at; and it was not until we reached nearly the last page that we found the gist of the whole matter in these words: "The specifically curative character of a drug depends upon the identity of the starting-point of its action upon the organism, with the point of invasion of the morbid principle. If these points be identical, the whole action of the drug will correspond with the nature of the disease; not otherwise, be the perceptible symptoms ever so similar. If the true formula of the specific law of cure be, then, "*similia similibus*," this formula should not be understood as simply referring to an outward similarity of the drug-symptoms to the symptoms of the natural disease. This similarity should be understood, in a compound sense, as applying to the drug-disease reflected by its pathogenetic symptoms, and to the morbid condition of the organism, or the pathological state, as manifested to the senses by its characteristic phenomena. The formula should, therefore, imply a perfect CORRESPONDENCE between the drug-disease and the natural pathological disturbance as MORBID STATES, not as mere SERIES OF SYMPTOMS; and, in order to leave no doubt that this compound similarity, or perfect correspondence, is the import of the formula, a more adequate expression thereof would be, "CORRESPONDENTIA CORRESPONDENTIBUS CURANTUR."

To reach these conclusions, our author has pursued a somewhat remarkable course; he relies chiefly on the assumption, that our knowledge of physiology and pathology is exact; which, if not so, his hypothesis fails, and is of no value. We might stop here, and claim a complete refutation

of the work under notice, for every physician knows, except our author, that even of physiology our knowledge is far from being complete, and far less do we know of pathology, in the modern meaning of that term. Our author says, on page 208, "Without the aid of physiology and pathology, it is useless to attempt to construct the art of healing upon a scientific basis. These twin-sisters of medicine enable us to give a positive direction to our provings, towards the sublime object of our art, which is the restoration of health; they enable us to understand the exact meaning, and to measure the true value, of our drug-symptoms, and to connect them with the phenomena of disease in such a manner, that they shall complete and explain each other, and, by this harmonious alliance, lead us to discover and establish this great and fundamental truth, that a mere apparent similarity of the drug-symptoms, and the symptoms of the disease, is not sufficient to constitute a certain drug the true remedial agent in a given case; that this similarity is even unnecessary, nay, impossible, in many cases; that it is frequently deceptive, almost always incomplete, and that, on this account, the law of cure, as expressed by Hahnemann, although embodying an abstract perception of truth, is nevertheless a fallacy of the sensual understanding, and not, by any means, a conception of the living reason. And they furthermore teach us, that a drug, in order to acquire the character of a remedial agent, in a given case of illness, must invade the organism by the same door, as it were, as the morbid agent. The starting-point of the action of the drug, and that of the disease, must be identical. Then, and only then, is the drug a specific remedial agent in the case." [The term "sensual understanding" is frequently used by our author, and the reader should keep its meaning in view, for it has an important bearing on the meaning of the whole work.] On page 37 it is written: "To be sure, what has so often happened in religion and law may likewise happen, and, unfortunately, has happened in Homœopathy: the apparent meaning of the literal text has been mistaken for the real, living doctrine,

and dead formulas, emanating from human conceit, and the deceitful illusions of the sensual understanding, may triumph, for a time, over the eternal and boundless expansive reason." In speaking of the law of cure, "like cures like," on pages 153, 154, our author says: "The series of symptoms which constitutes the natural disease is effaced by applying to it a drug that is capable of producing a series of similar symptoms in the healthy organism. This similarity embraces merely the outward form of the symptoms; it is a purely external similarity, totally distinct from the internal or essential condition of the organism." [Dr. H. does not tell us how he got this knowledge.] "And yet it is undeniable, that disease is not merely a numerical juxtaposition of symptoms, or subjective sensations, but a state of the organism, a disturbance of its normal laws. But a state of the organism has both quality and form. The sensually perceptible symptoms are the form, but not the quality, of that state. Quality and form constitute an inseparable unit in the light of reason; they cannot be parted without appearing altered in their essential principles. Quality without form is like love without wisdom, or like an idea without the word, or an attribute without a subject; and form without quality is an unmeaning, lifeless, illogical, and deceptive appearance." "Disease, without symptoms, would be like the vital principle without a nervous system; but symptoms, without internal conditions or relations, are unmeaning and valueless abstractions." [The intelligent reader will ask, What is the object of all these words? The answer is, To remove the basis of Homœopathy, and establish Allopathy if possible.] For our author says: "The strict homœopathist has no business to trouble himself about the internal state of the organism." [We hope not designedly omitting the fact, that the homœopathist never, if he does his duty, omits whatever developments there may be of internal derangements, these being a part of the case; but he never assumes, on speculative grounds, the internal condition of the organism; he is governed by positive proof addressed to the "sensual understanding," which, in our way of thinking, is about as inseparable, in our present state of existence, as our author's "quality and form."]

On page 176, we have these words: "The question then is: What drug will cure a given disease, and by what indications is this drug to be recognized? The answer to this question belongs to the domain of reason; pure experimentation and the observation of natural phenomena constitute the legitimate sphere of the sensual understanding; but reason determines the law which disposes the facts into an orderly system, and unites them into a general truth. Here is the great error which Hahnemann

committed in laying down his law "*similia similibus curantur*." This law is simply a perception of the sensual understanding, not a conception of the reason. Remove the sensually "perceptible phenomena of disease, by applying to them analogous sensually perceptible drug-symptoms." Again it is said: "The idea of similias is a fallacy only in practice, although even there partially true; but, in theory it is a truth, but only an *apparent* truth; it is not *the* truth." [This is beyond our reach, it is too deep. Our readers may be able to comprehend it.]

We make one more quotation, and shall conclude this notice of the "ORGANON OF SPECIFIC HOMŒOPATHY." "Disease is not, as is generally supposed, a state of the system opposite to health. This may seem paradoxical; and, nevertheless if disease, generally speaking, were the opposite of health, this general truth must certainly remain true in its particular applications. There must, therefore, be a quality or state of health opposite to typhus fever, another quality of health opposite to measles, another to rheumatism, another to paralysis, another to small-pox, another to dropsy, or in one word, every form of disease must have an opposite state or quality of health. This is evidently, not the case; hence we infer that the general principle, being false in all its particular applications, must itself be a fallacy, an illusion of the sensual understanding. Now then, if health and disease are neither opposite, nor identical states of existence, they must hold towards each other relations of more or less; health, therefore, is a less degree of disease, than what we generally term disease; and disease is a less degree of health, than what we generally term health. In adopting this mode of reasoning, I use the terms health and disease in an *absolute* sense, meaning by health the perfect harmony, and by disease the perfect disharmony of the physiological functions of the organism. A man's health may be so nearly perfect, that usage has justified the expression: He enjoys perfect health; but as long as human society and this planet remain invaded by disease, we cannot, strictly speaking, say that perfect health exists in a single instance; there is more or less of it in a given case, but it is never perfect.

Disease is a condition, a state of the material organism; it is a sign of its deviation from the essential order of the soul's divinely inspired love and wisdom, agreeable to whose indications and demands the material man should regulate his outward existence.

Before a perfect union between the internal spiritual and the external material organism can exist, reason, which is the soul's wisdom, has, in the first place, to reveal to man's sensual understanding the true order of his physical life; the produc-

tion, preparation, and the use of food; the various industrial pursuits, architecture, education, social government, and the whole complex machinery of our social rules, customs, and institutions, have to be known and organized agreeably to the eternal and unchanging principles of Divine Truth and Justice, before the eternal spiritual organism, the soul's true life, can infuse its regenerating energies into the material frame, and transform it again into what God had originally made it, a perfect tabernacle of divine harmony and beauty. The disunion between the internal spiritual and the external material organisms, must be characterized by sensations of pain, as the perfect union between these two organisms would be characterized by sensations of pleasure. It is the peculiar province of the physician to look at this disunion as existing between the bodily life as it is, and as it ought to be, agreeably to the demands and indications of the internal reason. In a general sense, this disunion may be marked by an absence of the blissful feeling of body and health; and, in a special sense, the disunion may be characterized by positive sensations of pain, and by abnormal appearances which indicate the presence of, but are not, the disease. I have defined disease as a state of disunion of the external material organism from the essential or externally true life of the internal spiritual man. Generally this disunion will exist until man shall have realized a perfect life of truth in all things, in religion, science, art, industry, education, and social government."

[Having placed before our readers enough of this work to enable them to form an opinion of its character, we shall pass the book with but few remarks. Dr. Hempel makes Rau, Griesselich, and Trinks, his "leaders," especially the first named, who also wrote an Organon for the same purpose Dr. H. wrote his. That purpose is to overthrow Homœopathy if possible, and introduce in its place a method of practice which is allopathic in its character.

Dr. Hempel had justly earned a reputation as a translator, but in this, his first attempt at authorship, he has failed sadly. We regret that it is so, for we respect the man for his zeal and industry in his efforts to propagate a true system of healing. We do not doubt Dr. H.'s integrity. We believe him honest; but as a reasoner, of which he speaks so much, he is exceedingly deficient. The work gives evidence in almost every part, that the author is a book-practitioner. If he has had much experience in the treatment of diseases, he has effectually concealed it in his book. We do regret that Dr. Hempel should have seen fit to write and publish the work under notice. We do not perceive of what possible use it can be to any one. Its arguments against Homœopathy have been used

by allopathists so often, that even the people are familiar with them; but Homœopathy, Hahnemann's Homœopathy, has steadily progressed notwithstanding, and we do not believe Dr. H. can prevent its continued progress. Dr. H., in his effort to demolish the foundation of Homœopathy, viz. the law of cure "like cures like," has, to our surprise, betrayed a want of a clear understanding of the practical application of that law. We will notice but a single blunder as proof of our charge—he says on page 112, "The meaning of this formula is that, in order to cure a disease, we have to prescribe a medicine which, if taken in sufficiently large quantities by a healthy person, will produce, in the healthy organism, a train of symptoms exactly similar to the symptoms of the natural disease which we are called upon to cure." [What authority the Doctor has for using the adverb "exactly" in that connection we do not know; which word there used, shows that Dr. H. does not yet understand "like cures like." His reasoning shows that he had not a clear idea of the distinction between similarity and identity. He forgets that similarity admits of degrees, and, consequently, he asserts, that a disease can have but one remedy, which is only an approximation to a right understanding of the law; for, although it may be properly said that in every case of disease there is one drug in its symptoms nearer in similarity to the symptoms of the disease than others, and will cure more promptly and certainly, yet other drugs more remotely similar will also cure; this is experienced by every true homœopathist, and it is the law too.

Dr. Hempel's chief argument then, against the *law of cure* fails in its application, and of course, it has no force; and Homœopathy as taught by Hahnemann, comes out of Dr. H.'s crucible more pure and more beautiful, commanding our confidence in a greater degree than ever.]

A HINT.

We doubt if any one has studied Homœopathy as diligently and thoroughly as Hahnemann, and yet we have occasion to notice many who have but barely read, and never studied, the writings of the master, who undertake to teach and practise what they virtually term improved Homœopathy, which, on examination, will prove to be only modified allopathy. Thousands of the people are deceived thereby, for they do not seek to inform themselves what constitutes homœopathic practice; but rely on those who announce themselves homœopathists.

For the American Journal of Homœopathy.

DR. MERRIT H. CASH.—*Respected Sir:*—Having disposed of Dr. Parkhurst's valuable and scientific "Paper"; having given him the benefit of an extended notice of his ancient hooks, cranes, kettles, boiled dinners and bad grammar, I take the liberty, since your appeal to the public is now the public's property, to notice your able essay entitled "Rational Medicine or the Regular Practice as it is: an appeal to the public." And I do this with a hearty good will, knowing as I do that no member of the medical profession in this county has exhibited a larger share of vindictiveness, or a more uncompromising spirit of intolerance towards all who do not acknowledge your medical superiority, or who refuse to yield a slavish homage to the mass of fallacies, contradictions, and absurdities, that go to make up your system of "Rational Medicine." Had the society before which this rational production was read, cast about for one who would out-Herod Herod in waging a warfare against medical reform and reformers, the lot, doubtless, would have fallen upon you: Othello finds a counterpart in the author of "Rational Medicine"; jealous of every innovation upon your "vested rights"; of every honest blow that threatens to weaken and prostrate the rickety fabric which you attempt to strengthen and defend; of every echo that comes from the people or the press condemnatory of your "rational" habit of scarifying, blistering, bleeding, bleaching, and otherwise destroying God's handiwork, it is no wonder that an urgent necessity is laid upon you to "appeal to the public"; in other words to seek to cajole the public into an earnest and practical avowal of the beauties and benefits of that "system" which seems to be the idol to which you pay your most devout and constant oblations. If the people will not yield themselves "a willing sacrifice" to the rack and torture, you must go to the people, and beg of them, just as a Frenchman politely begs his opponent to allow him the pleasure of stabbing him under the fifth rib, to submit to the process if, for no other reason, because it is a "rational" process—a "regular" practice. That people have been sick, and have taken medicine ever since sin entered the world nobody doubts. But you would have us to believe that the Allopathic physicians of to-day are the only rightful and legal representatives and practitioners of medicine; that by some primordial ordinance, human or divine, you and yours have been fore-ordained, elected, predestined and set apart to have and to hold through an unbroken succession, to the end of time, all medical knowledge and skill, and hold the monopoly of all means and measures wherewith to cure or kill the human family, conferring upon you and those who are to come after

you, rights, titles, and prerogatives which can never be acquired by any who are not in the legitimate line of descent. You strive by all means to impress the people with the idea that in such highly favored individuals as yourself, there exists a refined state of the cerebral organism, a quicker and more accurate perception of facts and things; a nicer adaptation to the impressions of scientific truth; a superior power of detecting, analysing, and comparing the shades and idiosyncracies of disease—in fine, a higher and more sublimated condition of the brain, which enables you to see and to know what "irregular physicians" must forever despair of seeing and knowing. But I wish to know, and the people to whom your "appeal" is made wish to know when, where, and by what authority these great powers and privileges and super-cerebral gifts were obtained? What priest-physician of the great family of the Asclepiades, has laid hands upon the august proprietor of "Rutger's Place," and set him apart to minister to the sick and to scourge and crucify the "outside barbarians?" I ask again, whence did you acquire the right to appropriate to yourselves the wide domain of medical science, and to doom to everlasting scorn and contempt every man who dares to question your medical infallibility, or who refuses to yield willing assent to your arrogant and insulting claims, based upon hoary antiquity, and your countless effete and rotten systems and hypotheses. You tell us that you have "a system,"—a "rational system" and that that system is of "very ancient origin." Contenting myself for the present with an emphatic denial of the assertion that you have "a" system, I ask you, admitting it is of "very ancient origin," what then? Do you hope to strengthen your position or win favor in this day by such an argument as this? What are mankind doing this hour, but struggling against tyrannies and abuses and systems that originated in the extremest antiquity—that are almost as ancient as sin itself? The most vigorous, the most noble, the most heaven-inspired efforts of the race are directed, with fierce antagonism, against these systems and these abuses. Cold Conservatism stands with her lean, lank finger, pointing to the records of the shadowy past, and frowns defiantly at Progress and her advancing train, bidding them to stand back, nor dare disturb the venerable monuments of authority, greatness and renown. Wherever humanity suffers most, wherever mind and body are enslaved and crushed, wherever the lash is most vigorously applied by the hand of tyrant or task-master, there you will find "ancient origin" and "ancient custom to be the beginning and end of all argument, an answer to all complaints, a barrier against all reforms. It is scarcely necessary to point a gentleman

of such extensive reading and literary acquirements as yourself to the innumerable hoary errors which modern science and investigation have consigned to the deepest depths of oblivion. In their day, these errors, systems and theories were upheld and defended by the same process of reasoning by which you seek to establish the superiority of your "Rational" system of medicine. Men have found them to be useless lumber, cumbering the progress of true science and mistifying and bewildering the earnest seeker after truth. If you have no stronger plea for your rational system than its "ancient origin," I advise you, most fraternally, to confine your lucubrations henceforth to the shades and solitude of "Rutger's Place."

But I have denied that you have a "system," rational or irrational, good, bad or indifferent. I assert that from the days of Hippocrates down to the hour which gave birth to the "Transactions of the New-York State Medical Society," what you would dignify by the term "system," has been nothing more nor less than a succession of controversies; of theory piled upon theory; of supposition bedaubed with conjecture; a series of fluctuations and conflicts; of windy hypotheses and bed-ridden philosophy, following, or over-riding each other like the waves of the sea, begotten, born, and strangled, looked at, condemned, and forgotten. If I speak of a "system" of astronomy, of chemistry or of geometry, I am guilty of no solecism in language. Can you seriously and honestly assert that the Allopathic practice of Medicine, "as it is" or has ever been, can maintain its claims to such a distinction? Pray tell us, then, when and where, in your peregrinations, you have stumbled upon, dug up or resuscitated from the sleep of ages, or wrought out from your own capacious, cerebral laboratory the materials which you can have the moral courage and hardihood to dignify and christen with the name of a "system," or a "science"? Sir, your search and your labor has heretofore been vain and unsatisfactory; and until the thick scales of prejudice fall from your eyes, as has been the past, so will be the future. When you can transmute Jersey mud into solid gold, then, perhaps, you will be able to construct a system out of the disjointed fragments that go to make up, in this, the year 1854, the "Regular Practice as it is"; for there is scarcely a "principle" in your so-called rational system, that has not been kicked and cuffed like a foot-ball by the first lights of your own "regular practice"; there is scarcely a proposition laid down by your most eminent authors or teachers that has not been decried, and spit upon, and utterly cast out by others of the same communion. Continual wrangling, antagonism, and strife have marked your history since your medical

inquisitors hunted down HARVEY like a beast of prey, drove him from his home and country, and cursed him in their heart of hearts for presuming to trespass upon their "ancient" domain of "rational medicine."

You say, "the ability, wisdom, purity, discrimination and far-seeing of the master minds who have labored in rearing the system, viz: Hippocrates, Galen, Celsus, Harvey, Sydenham, Jenner, Cullen, Rush, Velpeau, Liebeg, and a host of others of world-wide erudition and professional renown, is evidence uncontrovertible of its scientific character and well considered principles; and we have but to call to mind its past achievements, and the fact that it has withstood unharmed every attempt to disprove its reasonings, to become entirely satisfied of its invulnerable character, correct conclusions and adaptation to the cure of human ailments." Now, Doctor, any man of common sense would infer just this and nothing less or more from what you say in this quotation, namely, that there has existed unity of principle, unity of practice, and unity of opinion in the writings, lectures, sayings and doings of these great men from first to last; that there has been one general concurrence of sentiment running through and characterizing this list of illustrious men, that gives you warrant for saying that a fixed, demonstrable science or system has been discovered, agreed upon and universally acknowledged, and that that science or system is, identically, the "Regular Practice as it now is." Now, I pretend to say that there is not one solitary predicate, axiom or principle in the system that you tell us these "master minds" have erected, that is not directly or indirectly refuted, condempned or nullified by these very "master minds" themselves. You quote Dr. Rush as one of these. He is regarded by your medical brethren as the "key-stone of the arch," and his opinions, certainly, are entitled to the highest consideration. If, then, he was one of the master builders of your great temple, actively employed in adorning, amplifying and perfecting it, he is no mean judge of its character and condition. Hear what he says: "The healing art is an *unroofed temple*, uncovered at the top and cracked in the foundation." Again, he says, "Our want of success is occasioned by the following causes: 1st, our ignorance of the disease; 2d, our ignorance of a suitable remedy; 3d, want of efficacy in the remedy." Again, "We have assisted in multiplying disease, we have done more, we have increased their mortality." Dr. Rush spoke like an honest man his honest convictions. *He*, it seems, was *not* "entirely satisfied" of the adaptation of your system to "the cure of human ailments," and he ought to know, for he was one of your

"master minds." If Dr. Rush were living, he would characterize your "able essay" as an effusion of a conceited, hypochondriacal mind—as sound and fury, signifying nothing.

The placing of JENNER among the "master minds," from whose name and fame you seek to borrow a gleam of sunshine to relieve the ungainly aspect of your ancient temple, whose top is "roofless" and whose hypogeum is "cracked," is quite in keeping with the rest of your special pleading. Have you forgotten the merciless persecutions to which that great benefactor was subjected by the "regular" physicians of his day? After striving to load him with infamy, do you have the temerity to quote his name in support of your "rational" system? Jenner aimed a blow, and successfully, at the theories, speculations, and practice of his cotemporaries, who were blindly following the light that had come down to them from the most "ancient origin." Priest and Doctor accused him of affiliation with the devil. But when "the people" took him to their hearts, the same Judases that sought to betray and crush him, were glad to sit at his feet like fawning sycophants, for counsel and instruction.

Speaking of your medical practice on page 85th of the "Transactions," you say it is "the history, record, and repository of inventions, discoveries, and improvements in medicine and surgery, or art of healing from time immemorial, reposing its foundation on the inductive philosophy, which has proved itself a rock of adamant, on whose base the proudest waves, cast up from the ocean of visionary hypothesis, have fallen only to pronounce their epitaph and foreshadow the destiny of their successors." The "inventions, discoveries, and improvements" of Sydenham, who was another of your "master minds" were, of course, wrought out on the "inductive philosophy"; it follows as a necessary corollary, that the opinions and practice of Dr. Sydenham have escaped the fate of "visionary hypothesis" and are now an integral part of the rational system, adopted and practically applied by yourself and the other learned gentlemen who are the sole and only "regular" physicians of Orange County and "elsewhere." In order, therefore, to let the people know what Dr. Sydenham's inductive philosophy taught him to prescribe, as being "adapted to the cure of human ailments," I quote from his "*Processus Integrie*," p. 53-54. For the jaundice, he recommends volatile salts of earth worms, hog's lice, serpents and toads, or skins of hens' gizzards, powder of bulls' tails, volatile salts of urine, the ashes of sparrows' feathers, brain of partridges, galls of hogs, and powders of vipers' flesh. For palsy, the remedies are "powders of vipers' flesh and vipers' bones, volatile salts of earth worms, man's hair, and dried human

flesh." For epilepsy, we have "man's skull, filed or philosophically calcined, elk's hoof, and crab's eyes." For bleeding at the nose, "powder of man's blood, man's liver, the ashes of old hat, hog's excrements dried and powdered, drachm doses of the powder of wolf's gut."

Thus I have given you a specimen of the practice of one of your greatest "master minds," founded on the "inductive philosophy." Does it not afford an overwhelming argument in support of your "rational" system, and of the correctness of your opinion when you aver that it is "creditable alike to the profession and beneficial to the community"? And now, Doctor, in conclusion, as you advise us to "seek medication through the agency of rational medicine and the regular faculty," will you not be kind enough to mount the steps of one of our "Court houses," and proclaim to deluded humanity, your opinion of the efficacy of old hat, powdered bull's tail, hens' gizzards, and the other medicaments of the immortal Sydenham, whom you teach us to regard as one of the "master minds" of your system of "RATIONAL MEDICINE, OR THE REGULAR PRACTICE AS IT IS." Z

THE PHYSICIAN'S FEE

Is a matter not easily regulated, and certainly at times very hard to collect. What is but a light tax upon the rich, is often an onerous burden to the suffering poor; and hence the physician is compelled to vary his fee according to the means of his patrons. Acting even thus, his bills are noted for *slow returns*; perhaps no profession, not even the poor editor, is more subject to the worry and perplexity that attends the trouble of dunning than that of the physician.

We heard a collector who had been on a tour for days with the bills of a deceased physician—who, by the way, had left nothing but these bills for the support of a large and dependent family—exclaim, as he returned at last with more promises than dimes, "My definition of the extreme of punishment is, to ride a hard-trotting horse and collect doctor's bills." We did in no wise dissent.

Perhaps there is no class in community who give as much in the aggregate for the relief of suffering as the doctors. By night and by day he must hold himself in readiness for every call on his services. The rich demand it, and common humanity, if nothing more, impel him to be the poor man's friend. Now some people think that the attendance of the physician on the moneyless poor is thankless, unrewarded task, but we can assure them that at times it is quite the contrary. The sick poor are sometimes grateful, and gratitude awakens nobler feelings in the soul than proffered gold;

or even if this return is not made, yet a still nobler return is made in the consciousness the physician feels of having striven to do his duty.

There is a widow sick in this city with heart disease and consumption. Four years ago her earthly protector and husband was swallowed up in the great golden California Maelstrom, leaving her with poor health, scanty means, and three little children dependent upon her exertions—the charity of a Christian public and the God of the fatherless and the widow for a support. She has struggled on under these circumstances till Nature can wear no longer, and has now taken her bed to die. There is one thing that sustains her—faith in the promises of her God. Poor though she be, yet is she rich in these.

A few days since she handed her physician a card on which she had managed to write with a trembling hand the *Widow's Prayer*, which we venture to copy as it was written, styling it

THE WIDOW'S CHECK ON THE BANK OF HEAVEN.

O,
may the
blessing of
thy God wait
upon thee: May the
sun of Glory shine
around thy head, and
may the gates of plenty,
honor, and happiness be always
open to thee and thine. May no
strife disturb thy days; may no
sorrow distress thy nights; and may
the pillow of peace kiss thy cheek, and
the pleasures of imagination attend thy
dreams; and when length of years make
thee tired of earthly joys, and the curtains
of death gently close around the last
scene of thy earthly being, may the
angels of God attend thy bed, and
take care that the expiring lamp
of life shall not receive one
rude blast to hasten its
extinction; and finally,
may the Saviour's blood
wash thee from all
impurities, and at
last usher thee
into a land
of rest and
everlasting
felicity.
Amen!

Such as this is, or should be, more grateful to a physician's feelings than a check on the best bank in Chicago for one thousand dollars.

In contrast with the above, we will give the following truthful relation in the physician's own words, who himself was the recipient of what we shall call

THE RICH MAN'S GIFT.

I had just received my diploma from a Medical College in P—. I was proud of it, for it had cost me years of hard study and toil, having been obtained mainly by my own unassisted exertions. When I first took it in my hand, though poor and in debt, I felt, as most young physicians feel, as if mine was the power to cast out disease, and that the road to wealth and distinction was an open and smooth track before me. There were lessons for me to learn in these matters. I have learned them. But that is nothing here nor there.

Diplomated I entered into partnership with my old preceptor. One of my first patients was the only daughter of a wealthy man—a child of eight or ten years. She was very sick with Malignant Scarlatina. My partner and myself attended her faithfully for a week. She grew worse. I finally devoted my whole time to her case; for days and nights I did not undress, but was most assiduous in my attentions. Still she grew worse. A council of four physicians was called, and they declared her case an almost hopeless one. When I told the father the opinion of the council he was nearly frantic; he dropped upon his knees to me—wept, begged, implored me to save the life of his child—money should be mine—no matter how much—anything, everything—only save his child.

I watched the effect of the medicine given, and saw that it was hurtful. The patient was entirely unconscious, motionless and pulseless at the wrist; her eyes were glazed, set, and rolled up in her head; and it was with extreme difficulty she could swallow a few drops of liquid. I threw aside the medicine prescribed, and took my own counsel in the matter. She rallied a little. I watched and nursed her most assiduously for many hours as her life hung trembling, before there was a perceptible improvement. I staid by her till I could stand it no longer; I was sick myself—sick with the same disease for two weeks. She recovered; but her fever had been so intense that the skin all peeled from her body—the nails on her fingers and toes fell off—the hair from her head—large sloughs from her mouth—immense tumors gathered under her ears, and she was left nearly deaf.

All who knew of the case felt to my instrumentality the father was indebted for the life of his child. A gift or present to me was talked of. I made out no bill, feeling that salaried pay was no compensation. It was well I did not: the generosity of the gift—considering the relative pecuniary conditions of the giver and receiver—was astoundingly magnanimous.

In a few months the patient had nearly recovered under the care of my partner, but the gift came not. One day I called at the house. The father was in; he took

my hand, called his little girl to me, and, as his eyes filled with tears, said :

"Doctor, I owe to you the life of my little girl. I have never made you a present ; I've thought of it often, and now intend to do it."

He went into the adjoining room. Expectations were on tiptoe. In a moment he returned with—*four tolerably sized apples!*

"Here," said he, "take these as a present from me—they grew in one of my orchards."

The old man sat down, his eyes fairly dilating and glistening at the memory of the unwonted generosity. These four apples were the sum and substance, the length and breadth of the Rich Man's Gift.

We must confess that we like the "Widow's Check" better than the "Rich Man's Gift."—*Chicago Homceopathy.*

WHY SHAVE!*

THERE are misguided men, and I am one of them, who defile daily their own beards,—rasp them away as fast as they peep out from beneath the skin, mix them ignominiously with soap-suds, and cause them to be cast away with the offscourings of the house. We are at great pains and trouble to do this ; and we do it unwillingly, knowing that we deprive our faces of an ornament, and more or less, suspecting that we take away from ourselves something given us by nature for our use and our advantage, as indeed we do. Nevertheless, we treat our beards as so much dirt that has to be removed daily from our persons, for no other reason than because it is the custom of the country, or because we wish, or (according to the French philosopher) because we strive to make ourselves prettier by assimilating our appearance to that of woman.

I am no friend to gentlemen who wilfully affect external oddity, while they are within all dull and commonplace. I am not disposed, by carrying a beard myself, to beard public opinion. But opinions may change : we were not always a nation of shavers. The day may again come, when "Twill be merry in hall, when beards wag all," and Britons shall no more be slaves to razors.

I have never read of savages who shaved themselves with flints ; nor have I been able to discover who first introduced among civilized men the tonsure of the chin. The shaven polls and faces of ecclesiastics date from the time of Pope Anacletus, who introduced the custom upon the same liberal authority of Scripture, that still causes women to wear bonnets in our churches that they may not pray uncovered. St. Paul, in the same chapter, further asks the Corinthians, "Doth not even nature itself teach you,

that if a man have long hair it is a shame unto him?" Pope Anacletus determined, therefore, to remove all shame from churchmen, by ordering them to go shaven altogether. The shaving of the beard by laymen was, however, a practice much more ancient. The Greeks taught shaving to the Romans, and Pliny records that the first Greek barbers were taken from Sicily to Rome, by Publius Tleinius, in the four hundred and fifty-fourth year after building the city. The Greeks, however, (certainly it was so

in the time of Alexander,) seem to have been more disposed to use their barbers for pruning and trimming, than for the absolute removal of the beard, and of that ornament upon the upper lip which they denominated the *mystax*, and which we call, using the same name which they gave to it, slightly corrupted, moustache. In the best days of Greece, few but the philosophers wore unpruned beards. A large flowing beard and a large flowing mantle were, in those times, as naturally and essentially a part of the business of a philosopher, as a sign-board is part, in these days, of the business of a publican. So there is a small joke recorded of an emperor, who, having been long teased by an importunate talker, asked him who or what he was. The man replied in pique, "Do you not see by my beard and mantle, that I am a philosopher?" "I see the beard and mantle," said the emperor ; "but the philosopher, where is he?"

The idea that there existed a connection between a man's vigor of mind and body, and the vigor of growth in his beard, was confirmed by the fact that Socrates, the wisest of the Greek philosophers, earned pre-eminently the title of the bearded. Among races of men capable of growing rich crops on the chin, the beard has always been regarded, more or less, as a type of power. Some races, as the Mongolians, do not get more than twenty or thirty thick coarse hairs ; and are as likely then to pluck them out, after the fashion of some northern tribes, as to esteem them in an exaggerated way, as has sometimes been the case in China. In the world's history, the bearded races have at all times been the most important actors ; and there is no part of the body which, on the whole, they have shown more readiness to honor. Among many nations, and through many centuries, development of beard has been thought indicative of the development of strength, both bodily and mental. In strict accordance with that feeling, the strength of Samson was made to rest in his hair. The beard became naturally honored, inasmuch as it is a characteristic feature of the chief of the two sexes (I speak as an ancient), of man, and of man only in the best years of his life, when he is capable of putting forth his independent energies. As years multiply and judgment ripens, the beard

* From Dickens's Household Words.

grows, and with it grows, or ought to grow, every man's title to respect. Gray beards became thus so closely connected with the idea of mature discretion, that they were taken often as its sign or cause; and thus it was fabled of the wise king Numa, that he was gray-haired even in his youth.

To revert to the subject of shaving, Tacitus says that in his time the Germans cut their beards. In our times, among that people, the growth of a beard, or at least of a good *moustax* or moustache, had come, by the year eighteen hundred and forty-eight, to be regarded so much as a mark of aristocracy, that, after the revolutions of that year, the Germans took to the obliteration of the vain mark of distinction, by growing hair on their own chins and upper lips. Hairs have been thus made significant in a new way. There are now such things to be seen, on the Continent, as revolutionary beards; and not long ago, in a small German State, a barrister was denied a hearing because he stood up in his place in the law-court, wearing a beard of the revolutionary cut. Not only custom, but even to this day, law regulates the cultivation of the hair on many of our faces. There is scarcely an army in Europe which is not subject to some regulations that effect the beard and whiskers. In England the chin, and, except in some regiments, the upper lip, have to be shaved; elsewhere the beard is to be cultivated and the whiskers shaven. Such matters may have their significance. The most significant of whiskers are, however, those worn by the Jews in the East, and especially in Africa, who in accordance with a traditional superstition, keep them at a uniform level of about half an inch in length, and cut them into cabalistic characters curiously scattered about over the face.

As there are some communities especially bestowing care and honor on the beard, and others more devoted to the whiskers, so there are nations, as the Hungarian, in which the honor of the moustache is particularly cherished. The moustaches of General Haynau were about half a yard long. A Hungarian dragoon, who aspired to eminence in that way, and had nursed a pair of moustaches for two years, until they were only second to Haynau's, fell asleep one day, after dinner, with a cigar in his mouth. He awoke with one of his fine nose-tails so terribly burnt at the roots, that he was obliged afterwards to resort to an art used by many of his companions, and to fortify the weak moustache by twisting into its substance artificial hair.

Such freaks and absurdities are, of course, inconsistent with the mature dignity of bearded men. Let us have a whisker, beard, and moustache, reverently worn, and trimmed discreetly and with decency. I ask not for the cabalistic whisker, the

Hungarian moustache, or a beard like that worn by the Venetian magnate, of whom Sismondi relates, that if he did not lift it up, he would trip over it in walking. Still worse was the beard of the carpenter, depicted in the prince's court at Eidam, who, because it was nine feet long, was obliged, when at work, to sling it about him in a bag. A beard like either of these is, however, very much of a phenomenon in nature.

The hair of a man's head is finer, generally, than that on the head of a woman and, if left uncut, would not grow to nearly the same length. A woman's back hair is an appurtenance entirely and naturally feminine. In the same way the development of the hair upon the face of men, if left unchecked, although it would differ much in different climates and in different individuals, would very rarely go on to an extravagant extent. Shaving compels the hair to grow at an undue rate. It has been calculated that a man mows off, in the course of a year, about six inches and a half of beard; so that a man of eighty would have chopped up, in the course of his life, a twenty-seven-foot beard, twenty feet more perhaps, than would have sprouted had he left nature alone, and contented himself with so much occasional trimming as would be required by the just laws of cleanliness and decency.

It has been erroneously asserted, that a growth of beard would cover up the face, hide the expression of the features, and give a deceitful mark of uniform sedateness to the entire population. As for the last assertion, it is the direct reverse of what is true. Sir Charles Bell, in his Essay on Expression, properly observes that no one, who has been present at an assembly of bearded men, can have failed to remark the greater variety and force of the expression they are able to convey. What can be more portentous, for example, than to see the brow cloud, and the eyes flash, and the nostrils dilate, over a beard curling visibly with anger? How ill does a smooth chin support, at any time, the character assumed by the remainder of the face, except it be a character of sanctimonious oiliness that does not belong honestly to man, or such a pretty chin as makes the charm that should belong only to a woman or a child!

Therefore I ask, Why do we shave our beards? Why are we a bare-chinned people? That the hair upon the face of a man was given to him for sufficient reasons, it will take but little time to show. It has various uses, physiological and mechanical. To take a physiological use first, we may point out the fact that the formation of hair is one method of extruding carbon from the system, and that the external hairs aid, after their own way, in the work that is to be done by the internal lungs. Their use in this respect is not lessened by shaving: on

the contrary, the elimination of carbon through the hairs of the face is made to go on with unnatural activity, because the natural effort to cover the chin with hair is increased in the vain struggle to remove the state of artificial baldness, as a hen goes on laying if her eggs be taken from her; and the production of hair on the chin is at least quadrupled by the use of the razor. The natural balance is in this way destroyed. Whether the harm so done is great, I cannot tell; I do not know that it is: but the strict balance which a man keeps between the production of hair and the action of the lungs is too constant and rigid to be altogether insignificant. We have all had too much opportunity for noticing how, in people whose lungs are constitutionally weak, as in people with consumptive tendencies, the growth of the hair is excessive even to the eye-lashes. A skin covered with downy hair is one of the marks of a scrofulous child; and who has not been saddened by the charm of the long eye-lashes over the lustrous eye of the consumptive girl?

The very anomalies of growth show that the hair must fulfil more than a trifling purpose in the system. There has been an account published in the present century, by Ruggieri, of a woman twenty-seven years of age, who was covered from the shoulders to the knees with black woolly hair like that of a poodle-dog. Very recently, a French physician has related the case of a young lady, over whose skin, after a fever, hair grew so rapidly, that, at the end of a month, she was covered with a hairy coat an inch long, over every part of her body except the face, the palms of the hands, and the soles of the feet.

There are other less curious accounts of women who are obliged to shave, regularly, once or twice a week; and it may be asked, "Why are not all women compelled to shave? If beard and whiskers serve a purpose, why are they denied to women?" That is a question certainly not difficult to answer. For the same reason that the rose is painted and the violet perfumed, there are assigned by nature to the woman attributes of grace, heightened by physical weakness, and to the man attributes of dignity and strength. A thousand delicate emotions were to play about a woman's mouth, expressions that would not look beautiful in man. We all know that there is nothing more ridiculous to look at than a ladies' man, who assumes femininity to please his huge body of sisters, and wins their confidence by making himself quite one of their own set. The character of woman's beauty would be marred by hair upon the face; moreover, what rest would there ever be for an infant on the mother's bosom, tickled perpetually with a mother's beard? Not being framed for active bodily toil, the woman has not the man's capacious lungs,

and may need, also, less growth of hair. But the growth of hair in woman, is really not much less than in the other sex. The hair upon a woman's head is, as a general rule, coarser, longer, and the whole mass is naturally heavier than the hair upon the head of a man. Here, by the way, I should like to hint a question, whether, since what is gained in one place seems to be lost in another, the increased growth at the chin, produced by constant shaving, may not help to account for some part of the weakness of hair upon the crown, and of the tendency to premature baldness, which is so common in English civilized society.

The hair upon the scalp, so far as concerns its mechanical use, is no doubt the most important of the hair crops grown upon the human body. It preserves the brain from all extremes of temperature, retains the warmth of the body, and transmits very slowly any impression from without. The character of the hair depends very much upon the degree of protection needed by its possessor. The same hair, whether of head or beard, that is in Europe straight, smooth, and soft, becomes, after a little travel in the warm climates, crisp and curly, and will become smooth again after a return to cooler latitudes. By a natural action of the sun's light and heat upon the hair, that curliness is produced; and it is produced in proportion as it is required, until, as in the case of negroes, in the tropical suns of Africa, each hair becomes so intimately curled up with its neighbor, as to produce what we call a woolly head. All hair is wool, or rather all wool is hair; and that the hair of the negro differs so much in appearance from that of the European, is only because it is so much more curled, and the distinct hairs are so much more intimately intertwined. The more hair curls, the more thoroughly does it form a web in which a stratum of air lies entangled, to maintain an even temperature on the surface of the brain. For that reason it is made a law of nature, that the hair should be caused to curl most in the hottest climates.

A protection of considerable importance is provided in the same way, by the hair of the face, in a larger and important knot of nerves that lie under the skin near the angle of the lower jaw, somewhere about the point of junction between the whiskers and the beard. Man is born to work out of doors, and in all weathers, for his bread: woman was created for duties of another kind, which do not involve constant exposure to the sun, wind, and rain. Therefore man only goes abroad whiskered and bearded, with his face muffled by nature in a way that shields every sensitive part alike from wind, rain, heat, or frost, with a perfection that could be equalled by no muffler of his own devising. The whiskerless seldom can bear long exposure to a sharp wind that

strikes on the bare cheek. The numbness then occasioned by a temporary palsy of the nerves has, in many cases, become permanent; I will say nothing of aches and pains that sometimes affect the face or teeth. For man who goes out to his labor in the morning, no better summer shield or winter covering against the sun or storm can be provided, than the hair which grows over those parts of the face which need protection, and descends as beard, in front of the neck and chest; a defence infinitely more useful, as well as more becoming, than a cravat about the neck or a prepared bear-skin over the pit of the stomach. One of the finest living prose-writers in our language suffered for many years from sore throat, which was incurable until, following the advice of an Italian surgeon, he allowed his beard to grow; and Mr. Chadwick has pointed out the fact, that the sappers and miners of the French army, who are all men with fine beards, are almost entirely free from affections of the lungs and air-passages.

Mr. Chadwick regards the subject entirely from a sanitary point of view. He brought it under the discussion of the medical section engaged on sanitary inquiries at the York meeting of the British Association, and obtained, among other support, the concurrence of Dr. W. P. Allison, of Edinburgh. We name that physician because he has since persuaded the journeyman masons of his own city to wear their beards, as a preventive against consumption that prevailed among them.

For that is another use of the beard and moustache. They protect the opening of the mouth, and filter the air for a man working in dust or smoke of any kind; they also act as a respirator, and prevent the inhalation into the lungs, of air that is too frosty. Mr. Chadwick, years ago, was led to the discussion of this subject by observing how, in the case of some blacksmiths who wore beards and moustaches, the hair about the mouth was discolored, by the iron dust that had been caught on its way into the mouth and lungs. The same observer has also pointed out and applied to his argument, the fact that travellers wait, if necessary, until their moustaches are grown, before they brave the sandy air of deserts. He conceives, therefore, that the absence of moustache and beard, must involve a serious loss to laborers in dusty trades—such as millers and masons, to men employed in grinding steel and iron, and to travellers in our dusty roads. Men who retain the hair about the mouth are also, he says, much less liable to decay or achings of the teeth.

To this list we would add also, that, apart from the incessant dust flying in town streets and inseparable from town-life, there is the smoke to be considered. Both smoke and dust do go into the lungs, and

only in a small degree it is possible for them to be decomposed and removed by the processes of life. The air-passages of a Manchester man or a resident of the city of London, if opened after death, are found to be more or less colored by the dirt that has been breathed. Perhaps it does not matter much; but surely we had better not make dust-holes or chimney-funnels of our lungs. Beyond a certain point, this introduction of mechanical impurity into the delicate air-passages does cause a morbid irritation, marked disease, and premature death. We had better keep our lungs clean altogether; and for that reason men working in cities would find it always worth while to retain the air-filter supplied to them by nature for the purpose,—the moustache and beard around the mouth.

Surely enough has been here said to make it evident, that the Englishman who, at the end of his days, has spent an entire year of his life in scraping his beard, has worried himself to no purpose, has submitted to a painful, vexatious, and not merely useless but actually unwholesome custom. He has disfigured himself systematically throughout life, accepted his share of unnecessary *tic-douloureux* and tooth-ache, coughs, and colds,—has swallowed dust, and inhaled smoke and fog,—out of complaisance to the social prejudice which happens just now to prevail. We all abominate the razor while we use it, and would gladly lay it down. Now, if we see clearly—and I think the fact is very clear—that the use of it is a great blunder, and if we are no longer such a slovenly people as to be afraid that, if we kept our beards, we should not wash, or comb, or trim them in a decent way, why can we not put aside our morning plague, and irritate our skin no more as we do now?

I recommend nobody to grow a beard in such a way as to isolate himself in appearance from his neighbors. Moreover, I do not at all desire to bring about such a revolution as would make shaven chins as singular as bearded ones are now. What I should much prefer would be the old Roman custom, which preserved the first beard on a young man's face until it became comely, and then left it entirely a matter of choice with him whether he would remain bearded or not. Though it would be wise in an adult man to leave off shaving, he must not expect, after ten or twelve years of scraping at the chin, when he has stimulated each hair into undue coarseness and an undue rapidity of growth, that he can ever realize upon his own person the beauty of a virgin beard. If we could introduce now a reform, we that have been inured to shaving may develop very good black beards, most serviceable for all working purposes, and a great improvement on bald chins; but the true beauty of the beard remains to be developed, in the next

generation, on the faces of those who may be induced from the beginning, to abjure the use of razors.

Law Regulating the Practice of Medicine and Surgery in New Jersey.

HERETOFORE, the laws of the State of New Jersey have been such, as to operate very disadvantageously to all homœopathic physicians, who were not graduates of certain specified colleges or universities. It will be seen from the following supplement to the act, that the law now requires, merely, that all physicians entitled to collect fees for their services, should be graduates of regularly instituted Medical Schools, —requiring three years preparatory study and instruction in all the branches of a thorough Medical Education. As the Homœopathic Medical College of Pennsylvania answers all the requirements of the law, and is prepared to impart as thorough a knowledge in professional studies, as any college in the country, and has done so, even up to the present time, we cannot refrain from expressing ourselves gratified, that justice is no longer withheld from our graduates in New Jersey.

A SUPPLEMENT to an act entitled "An Act to incorporate medical societies for the purpose of regulating the practice of physic and surgery in this State," passed January 28th, 1830.

WHEREAS certain practitioners of physic and surgery in this State, labor under certain disability in the practice of their profession, owing to existing laws, by which they are unable to collect their dues, and are liable to pains and penalties in the pursuit of their profession; therefore,

1. BE IT ENACTED by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, That it shall be lawful for all persons of good moral character, who have diplomas from any medical college, or from the medical department of any university of any State of the United States, which, before conferring diplomas, require those upon whom they are conferred to be twenty-one years of age, to have studied physic and surgery three full years with a respectable and lawful practitioner of medicine, including two full courses of lectures of not less than twelve weeks each, in which shall be taught the principles of *Materia Medica*, Pharmacy, Chemistry, Anatomy, Physiology and the practice of Physic, Surgery and Midwifery, to practice Physic and Surgery in this State, after depositing a copy of such diploma, translated in the English language, or other evidence of graduation, with the clerk of the county in which such practitioner may reside; and

until such copy shall be so deposited those practitioners who shall neglect the same shall be liable to the penalty of the act to which this is a supplement; and it shall be the duty of the said clerk to file such copy in his office, for each of which he shall receive twelve and a half cents, and no more, from the practitioner who may deposit the same.

2. And be it enacted, That all acts and parts of acts conflicting with the provisions of this act, be and the same are hereby repealed. Approved March 17, 1854.—*Phila. Journal of Homœopathy.*

In general, how little the people know of medicine! It is a fact, that few confine themselves to what they know, but meddle with that they know the least. For practical purposes most persons understand diet, and a course of life consistent with health, as well as physicians; but in this there is pretended ignorance, and they rely on medical men with the simplicity of children; but of diseases and their treatment, there are few but assume to be competent to judge, and their self-confidence would seem to be in proportion to the difficulty of the cases.

UNFRIENDLY feelings among medical men have never done any good, and there is no reason to expect they ever will. If the members of the profession are honest and seek for a true healing art, why not discard that which stands in the way of progression in medical science? No man can diligently labor in any cause, but in some measure he will promote the progress of that cause, whatever his talents may be. It is an error to suppose that, because a man possesses moderate abilities, imperfectly cultivated, he should be discarded as useless; for experience shows that sometimes uncultivated minds throw out hints which lead the more talented to useful discoveries. Therefore we say, encourage the members of the profession to labor, and keep up a free and friendly intercourse, for the interest of all will be thereby promoted.

This Journal will hereafter be published on the 1st of each month, after the 1st and 2d numbers of the 9th volume, which will be out in a few days.